# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/679,536 | 10/03/2003 | Matthew A. Paulin | 0001.002 | 3983 |

| 7590 08/21/2007 | EXAMINER |
|---|---|
| Gerhard P. Shipley | ABEBE, DANIEL DEMELASH |
| 300 Clayton Court | |
| Lawrence, KS 66044 | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2626 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 08/21/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 10/679,536 | PAULIN, MATTHEW A. |
| **Office Action Summary** | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Daniel D. Abebe | 2626 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2-7</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2-7</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

# DETAILED ACTION

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li-

Chun Wang et al (2006/01222839) in view of Sundareson (2004/0215447)

As to claims 2, Li-Chun teaches a method for identifying comparing the position

of sound files, comprising the steps of :

Determining the frequency value of a signal;

Selecting points where the energy is maximum in the time frequency

spectrogram;

Assigning /Tagging the sound file using time points; and

During Identifying, conducting the steps above for the unidentified signal; and

Comparing the unidentified signal with the database tagged signal to identify.

(par.005; 0064; abstract; Figs.7-10)

Li-Chun doesn't explicitly teach where the sound file is converted from time domain to frequency domain and indexed in frequency domain. Sundareson however, teaches a method of identifying an audio file and more particularly "**classifying each audio file by means of a group of parameters. The original audio file is divided into frames and each frame is compressed by means of a psycho-acoustic algorithm, the resulting files being in the frequency domain. The resulting frames are divided into frequency sub-bands. A parameter identifying the average spectral power for all the frames is generated. The set of parameters for all of the bands can be used to classify the audio file and to compare the audio file with other audio files**." (Par.0011; Par.0005; Fig.10; abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Li-Chun's teaching in view of Sundareson disclosure for the purpose of improving the system.

As to claim 3, Sundareson teaches where the corresponding parameter is generated for a second audio file.

As to claims 4-5, Sundareson teaches where the parameters of the audio file is compared to identify the audio file (Fig.10).

Claims 6 and 7 are analogous to the claims above and are rejected by Li-Chun and Sundareson for the foregoing reasons.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel D. Abebe whose telephone number is 571-272-7615. The examiner can normally be reached on monday-friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daniel Abebe Primary Examiner A.U 2626

August 14, 2007